

# **INTERIM JOINT COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION**

## **Subcommittee on Postsecondary Education**

### **Minutes of the 1st Meeting of the 2004 Interim**

**August 9, 2004**

The 1st meeting of the 2004 Subcommittee on Postsecondary Education of the Interim Joint Committee on Education was held on Monday, August 9, 2004, at 10:00 AM, in Room 131 of the Capitol Annex. Senator Jack Westwood, Presiding Co-Chair, called the meeting to order, and the secretary called the roll.

Present were:

Members: Senator Jack Westwood, Co-Chair; Representative Mary Lou Marzian, Co-Chair; Senators Vernie McGaha, and Gary Tapp; Representatives Buddy Buckingham, Hubert Collins, C.B. Embry Jr., Mary Harper, Reginald Meeks, and Kathy Stein.

LRC Staff: Jonathan Lowe, Audrey Carr, Jake Eaton, and Lisa Moore.

Senator Westwood welcomed the new members to the subcommittee. He introduced Mr. Tom Layzell, President of the Council on Postsecondary Education (CPE), who presented on the strategic plan and funding model reviews. Senator Westwood explained that since 1998, the work of the CPE has been guided by a document called the 2020 Vision: The Public Agenda for Kentucky's System of Postsecondary Education. He said the document is based on the provisions of House Bill 1 passed during the special legislative session of 1997. He said because the document is about six years old, the CPE is undertaking a comprehensive review and an update of the public agenda, and the companion action agenda, during the interim. Senator Westwood said President Layzell would describe the process being used to update the strategic plan, and members should have copies of the PowerPoint presentation in their folders.

Mr. Layzell recognized CPE's Chairman Steve Barger, and Vice-Chairman Ronald Greenberg, in the audience. He said he would present strategic planning process and the comprehensive funding model review together because they are linked together in the work currently being conducted by the CPE. Mr. Layzell said House Bill 1 requires the CPE to periodically update its strategic agenda for the Commonwealth, and it is busy doing that this year.

Mr. Layzell said the goals of House Bill 1 represent one of the most comprehensive reform efforts in the country, and it is a model that is both admired and emulated around the country. He said the basic purpose was to increase the overall levels of educational attainment of Kentuckians, and by doing so, to improve the quality of life and economic development in the commonwealth.

Mr. Layzell said six goals were established in House Bill 1, and they are summarized on slides three and four in the members' handouts. He said part of CPE's process, as required by statute, is to examine the goals to see if there is refinement needed, or if additional goals need to be added.

Mr. Layzell said CPE has developed five questions, which are also statements of policy, and provide a basis for developing indicators of progress towards achievement of the goals that were set forth in 1997. They are: 1) are more Kentuckians ready for college; 2) are more students enrolling; 3) are more students advancing through the system; 4) are we preparing Kentuckians for life and work; and 5) are Kentucky's communities and economy benefiting. Mr. Layzell said the answer to all of these questions is yes, but as Kentucky has made significant progress in all the areas, there is much more work to be done.

Mr. Layzell said that as the CPE moves into the process of examining postsecondary reform, additional questions need to be asked. They include: 1) are we still asking the right questions; 2) do we have the right goals; 3) what are we missing; and 4) what is it going to take to achieve this agenda.

Mr. Layzell said there are four phases in the strategic planning process. They are: 1) Phase One: Process Design - Spring, Summer 2004; 2) Phase Two: Current Assessment and 2020 projections - Summer 2004; 3) Phase Three: Statewide Plan Development, using statewide forum/trusteeship conference, regional forums, and partner conversations - Fall, Winter 2004-2005, and 4) Phase 4: Campus Plan Development, using campus forums to determine regional priorities, mission parameters, priorities for action, and performance measures - Winter, Spring, Summer 2005. He said Kentucky is now in between phases two and three. He said an update will be presented in the fall of the 2020 Impact Analysis. The original analysis was conducted by the CPE in 1998, and there was a projection that 80,000 more undergraduates would be needed by 2020 in order to meet the national average of educational attainment. Mr. Layzell said times have moved on, and other states have moved on, and it is time to reassess this analysis and determine what it is going to take now to accomplish the same things by 2020.

Mr. Layzell said there are many parties that will be involved in the strategic planning process. There have been a series of preliminary meetings beginning in the spring with campus representatives, legislators and Legislative Research Commission (LRC) staff, executive branch staff, the Strategic Committee on Postsecondary Education

(SCOPE), the Prichard Committee, and various other entities, to solicit some thoughts about the regional forums, and determining the best way to proceed.

Senator Westwood asked about the five questions of postsecondary reform. He said the first four questions seem to be fairly easy to measure, but that the question about Kentucky's communities and economy benefiting would be a very difficult characteristic to measure. He asked Mr. Layzell what standards were used to determine the answer to the question.

Mr. Layzell said part of the review process is to look at indicators and see if additional indicators need to be developed to capture this information. Up to this point, the major indicator to measure question five has been looking at research and development expenditures, and extramural expenditures, whether federal and state contracts, or private grants and contracts at the universities. The theory being that those expenditures have the potential over time to benefit communities and the economy. Mr. Layzell said this question is more difficult to measure than some of the other questions, and the CPE is trying to develop new indicators, but there have not been that many indicators developed across the country. He said Kentucky has significant workforce training programs through the Kentucky Community and Technical College System (KCTCS), and adult education programs that have generated new statistics that can help show if the overall system is really having an impact on the economy.

Senator Westwood said the research institutions, University of Kentucky (UK) and the University of Louisville (UofL), would justify a consideration for research and development expenditures, but that still omits a lot of the regional universities because they are not involved in research and development to the same degree. For example, Northern Kentucky University (NKU) is very interested in economic development, and he said that would be a good way to evaluate the progress that is happening in Northern Kentucky. Mr. Layzell agreed, but said comprehensive universities do engage in applied research, which does translate into assistance to local economic development efforts.

Mr. Layzell said there was a request for funding with the CPE's budget request for the regional stewardship initiative, which was based in large part on the work done in Northern Kentucky by Dr. Votruba and members of the NKU staff, along with regional agencies and entities that are involved. He said these types of efforts on the part of comprehensive institutions are by and large not revenue producers, and are often cost centers, and so this type of work is often not pursued by individual faculty and staff. Mr. Layzell said this is an approach that the CPE will pursue in future funding cycles, and they will begin to develop some measures around those types of institutions that will help Kentucky get more precise answers as to whether it is making a difference in benefiting communities and the economy. Mr. Layzell believe these types of efforts do make a difference to communities and the regions, and will continue to make one.

Senator Westwood asked if the CPE's funding recommendations would be based upon the answers to the five questions of postsecondary reform. Mr. Layzell said he would discuss this issue in the next part of the presentation about the comprehensive funding model review.

Representative Marzian referred to UK's goal of becoming a top 20 research university, in line with the goals of House Bill 1. She said at the time, there were certain criteria assigned to be in the top 20, such as the number of PhD's in the programs, and how much money was obtained in research grants. She feels that UK and UofL have made great efforts in this area, and UK had an article in the paper that they had raised \$248 million dollars. Mr. Layzell said both universities have made great strides, but the universities want to try to articulate to the legislature and others what it takes to get from where Kentucky is now to where it needs to be. The goal that was established with those two institutions for extramural funding was combined \$1 billion dollars for UK and UofL by the year 2020. He said they are at \$450 million between the two schools now, and straining to reach the capacity of these research and development expenditures. To move forward, it is going to require more facilities, faculty, and infrastructure to support the research programs. The top research institutions are not standing still. They are moving ahead, and moving ahead aggressively. States such as Kentucky that have historically not had a lot of federal funding in comparison to other states, are already well behind the mark, and have to move aggressively to get close to the top research institutions.

Mr. Layzell said one measure toward these goals is federal research and development expenditures. The National Science Foundation published a report in 2002 that said if UK were 20th in public institutions, they would have had to spend about an additional \$88 million. If the UofL had been 50th instead of 85th in 2002, they would have had to have spent about \$90 million more. He said this financial burden should not all fall on the Commonwealth of Kentucky. There are funding sources to help with this, most notably, federal agencies, and private grants and contracts.

Representative Buckingham responded to the question about whether Kentucky's communities and economy benefiting. He said one of the issues that precipitated the 1997 reform was the issue of the UK Engineering School in Paducah, and Murray State University's opposition at the time. He said the engineering program has resulted in a much stronger bond between the four community colleges in the service area of Murray State. The offerings of classes has increased greatly, as well as the number of students attending the community colleges, and completing a four-year degree. The addition of the new economy program in 2000 provided more economic development opportunities between the community colleges and the university, as well as workforce development partnerships with the community colleges to help displaced workers.

Representative Buckingham said that a student attending college now, who was not previously attending, usually results in a net economic gain for the community of

somewhere between \$5,000-8,000 a year per student over and above the tuition, and the cost of their education. He said there are 35,000 to 40,000 more students now, so there is quite a bit of economic gain being picked up for the community. He said the results in Western Kentucky are proving to be very fruitful in a number of ways.

Senator Westwood said he agreed, and wanted to make the point that Kentucky should be looking at other things besides research, such as economic development. Mr. Layzell said one of the most innovative research programs created was the Bucks for Brains program. The increase in intellectual capital, and jobs created from the program have been significant.

Mr. Layzell said the funding model is an inextricable part of this larger strategic planning process. One of the major objectives of the review is to make sure there is a strong linkage between the funding model and things like the strategic planning process. He said the two major questions for the funding model are: is the funding adequate; and is it equitable. Finally, the last objective of the funding model is accountability. Mr. Layzell said there needs to be some better articulation of the funding request and performance expected. For example, a major component of the current funding model is the benchmark comparison process. Benchmark comparisons are an important attribute of any funding model. Kentucky's benchmark process to date has essentially been a revenue based model, and identifies funding gaps that the analysis generated. Mr. Layzell said this process generated a request for \$315 million dollars for Kentucky this year. He said Kentucky needs to look at benchmarks in terms of performance on key indicators such as retention rates, graduation rates, and degree production.

Mr. Layzell said Kentucky also needs to review its expenditure analysis by looking at not only revenue comparisons, but how the money is being spent. He said in other states, some interesting patterns have developed. An institution might appear overfunded or underfunded in terms of appropriations per student, but when breaking down expenditure comparisons in categories such as construction, research, and public service, there are pockets within the institutions that appear to be overfunded, while in the aggregate, they compare to their benchmarks where they are underfunded.

Mr. Layzell said other issues to be reviewed include the funding distribution methodology; which is a term used to describe how funds would be distributed if the General Assembly does not fund the total request; capital issues; and the strategic investment and incentive funding, or trust funds.

Mr. Layzell said the review of base funding will mainly consist of reviewing the benchmark process versus another approach of a funding formula. He said Kentucky may need to look at other models around the country that might be better suited to today's circumstances.

Mr. Layzell said the process for peer selection within the benchmark model is an area in which Kentucky's current model has eroded. He said 20 criteria were identified for benchmark selection, and institutions around the country were surveyed to determine those that were closest to Kentucky institutions, and the top 20 institutions were chosen to be the benchmarks. Over time this process has eroded, so it will be reviewed for improvements that can be made.

Mr. Layzell said the missions of the universities need to be sufficiently differentiated in the funding model. Comprehensive universities and their role fit into this category.

Mr. Layzell said capital issues include space utilization standards, and a process for updating guidelines and standards. He said Kentucky needs to review the criteria used to recommend capital requests to the General Assembly, and needs a better process for evaluating capital projects, and selecting priorities.

Mr. Layzell said Kentucky needs to review the assumptions and priorities in the event of allocation of less than full funding. He said funds could be distributed to three categories of base adjustments, common percentage increase, and equity.

Mr. Layzell said priorities among existing trust funds, and the potential of new trust funds, will be reviewed in the strategic investment and incentive funding programs. He said Kentucky needs recognition of institutional mission, and linkages to the statewide strategic agenda.

Mr. Layzell said the LRC staff and the state budget staff have been full participants in this funding model review. The CPE thought it was important that those linkages were established early in order to get feedback during the process as to whether the CPE is on the same course as the views of the General Assembly members.

Mr. Layzell said the timeline for the comprehensive funding model review is: 1) draft recommendations by the November CPE meeting in 2004; 2) final action by January/February CPE meeting in 2005; and 3) implementation in the fiscal year 2006-2008 CPE budget recommendation in November 2005.

Senator Westwood introduced Dr. Gary A. Ransdell, President, Western Kentucky University (WKU), and Dr. Gail W. Wells, Vice-President for Academic Affairs & Provost, (NKU), who will provide their views on the funding model from the institutional perspectives.

Dr. Ransdell commended Mr. Layzell and the CPE for the effort of this comprehensive review of the strategic planning process and the funding model. He said the benchmark model is a good model, though some campuses may take issue with

institutions on their respective list, which is to be expected when there are 18-20 institutions on a benchmark list. He feels the model has worked relatively well with the exception that it has not been funded adequately. He said any model can be viewed as flawed if little money exists to support it.

Dr. Ransdell said funding available since the higher education reform in 1998, has not been able to be used for operating support and basic classroom costs, thus creating difficulties. He said there was no provision in higher education reform in the current funding model to support enrollment growth, particularly in the absence of increases in state funding in the last two biennial budgets. Consequently, every new student has put more pressure on the institution's operating budgets. He feels the state called for growth, and then has not been able to fund it.

Dr. Ransdell said institutions are becoming more tuition driven. He said in 1998, WKU operated on a ratio of 38 percent tuition, and 62 percent state appropriations. In the Fall 2004 semester at WKU, the ratio is 55 percent tuition, and 45 percent state appropriations, which is a dramatic shift.

Dr. Ransdell said all of Kentucky's surrounding states have higher average tuition at their public institutions, except for West Virginia. Kentucky equals Tennessee and West Virginia in tuition as a percent of per capita personal income. Enrollment is up at WKU by 4,000 students, and even with tuition costs rising, the applicant pool has gone from 6,000 to 11,000 since House Bill 1 went into effect. Dr. Ransdell said financial aid is up as well. He said the state and the campuses are working hard to provide sufficient merit and need-based financial aid. WKU has 52 percent of its students (4,929 students out of a total in-state population of 9,403) that are getting more aid than the total cost of a WKU education (tuition, books, room and board). Only 11 percent of WKU students (1,141) receive no financial aid.

Dr. Ransdell said the public institutions need help. He said the five critical areas that the state can help address are: 1) resume incremental funding while focusing on base operating budgets, and address inequities that have come into play because of the demographics since House Bill 1 went into effect; 2) help with capital and deferred maintenance needs; 3) assist with student stacking - where students receive more financial aid from the campus and from the state than the total cost of their education; 4) help to provide relief from unfunded mandates; and 5) allow flexibility to issue campus debt if the campus can cover that debt service with agency funds.

Dr. Ransdell said House Bill 1 has changed the missions of public institutions. The primary objective at one time was simply to educate students, and while that is a main focus today, economic development and improved quality of life are now driving the eight Kentucky campuses and the KCTCS as well. Kentucky's emerging mission is to

drive the economy in the respective regions of the state, and to identify and solve problems in the respective regions in the state.

Dr. Ransdell provided the members with a handout that showed national comparisons of the change in resident undergraduate student charges and state appropriations, for public colleges and universities, 2003-2004 tuition and fees at WKU for a full-time undergraduate Kentucky resident as a percentage of per capita personal income, a "sticker price" analysis, data for benchmark institutions, and the percentage change in tuition and fees from 1987 through 2007.

Dr. Wells said she was happy to be representing Dr. James Votruba, who had to honor a prior commitment to participate in a conference for new university presidents. Dr. Wells said she agreed with Dr. Ransdell on every point he made. She feels that NKU and WKU share a mission that is common in many respects, and face the same challenges of rapid growth and underfunding. She said the current funding model was developed with good intentions, but in a different time when budget expansion was occurring making it possible to address equity funding. The model does not work as well now, since it does not address equity of funding, nor the increasing demands on Kentucky's universities.

Dr. Wells said the current funding model does not permit universities to meet the increasing demands of their communities. Today, every university is asked to address issues above and beyond basic instruction. Many regions are asking their universities to be a full partner in addressing the issues important to communities such as greater economic vitality, the P-12 schools, improved public health, environmental concerns, and the creation of a citizenry more engaged in the democratic process. The new vision for the 21st century comprehensive university is an innovative institution that not only produces well prepared college graduates, but also serves as a center for improving the economic prosperity and quality of life of its community. The potential for positive impact is staggering. However, such work must be funded, and requires public policy that supports that engagement.

Dr. Wells said the regional universities can play an important role in recruiting high tech industry. She is not proposing the schools to become Division 1 research institutions, as Kentucky already has two universities with that role, but the regional universities can play a vital role in the commercialization and application of the research produced at UK, UofL, other institutions, and through the private sector. Dr. Wells said, in addition, companies look to regional universities for involvement in many aspects where proximity is important. For example, provision of interns, technical services, use of technical infrastructure, graduates, interaction with faculty, state-of-the-art training and re-training, and quality of life issues in the community. She said research shows that businesses competing on the basis of innovation locate based on regional knowledge, regional relationships, regional mindset, and regional face-to-face interaction. Open



systems of innovation require many ingredients in close proximity to the operation. Dr. Wells said the Commonwealth cannot afford public policy that does not capitalize on opportunities for universities to develop the infrastructure, depth, and intellectual capital required to partner with others in the community to stimulate economic growth in the region, and attract high tech, and high paying jobs to the area.

Dr. Wells said there is a vision for the 21st century regional university that is a full partner in improving P-12 education. The regional institutions are called upon to work with P-12 teachers and administrators; offer enrichment activities for students encouraging them to plan for postsecondary education, even while they are in elementary school; share faculty members to lead initiatives such as demonstration projects, and impact and policy analyses; work with the community to address the out of school needs of students; and produce the next generation of successful teachers. Dr. Wells said investments in these activities produce high returns. The Commonwealth cannot afford public policy that does not invest in such work.

Dr. Wells said there is a vision for the 21st century regional university that is a full partner in improving healthcare. She said universities are forming partnerships with hospitals, and health alliances to produce nurses, and other health professionals; provide leadership in public health discussions; and otherwise give added value to the healthcare issues of the region. The Commonwealth cannot afford public policy that does not invest in such work.

Dr. Wells said there is a vision for the 21st century regional university that is a full partner in creating a livable community. She said it should address quality of life driven concerns such as environmental quality; urban and neighborhood revitalization; land use; transportation congestion; housing; and cultural opportunities. The Commonwealth cannot afford public policy that does not invest in such work.

Dr. Wells said there is a vision for the 21st century regional university that is a full partner in enhancing governmental effectiveness. She said this includes addressing important public policy issues; holding seminars, lectures, and discussions on issues of public concern; and proving non-profit management, and contributing to issues of social inclusion, and addressing poverty. The Commonwealth cannot afford public policy that does not invest in such work.

Dr. Wells said most programs that target the needs of economic development, public schools, small businesses, government agencies, and non-profits, require the support of public funds. In spite of the need to address these complex issues of public engagement, the current funding model is tied to one simple measure, which is instruction. Dr. Wells said several of Kentucky's institutions are underfunded to appropriately address instruction, and dramatically underfunded to meet the needs of their communities. For example, NKU, compared to other state universities in the Fall of 2003

semester, received the lowest state funding of the regional institutions. She said NKU was \$1,600 per student below the median of the regional institutions. This would require \$15 million dollars just to bring NKU up to the median. NKU was the only regional institution below the KCTCS schools. She said in consideration to where NKU stands in relationship to its benchmarks or peers, state funds would have to be doubled from \$40 million to \$80 million just to bring it up to the median, or the goal.

Dr. Wells said the comparative underfunding has been exacerbated by the 20 percent growth in students at NKU over the last four years, and the fact that the base budget has been reduced by \$3.3 million over the last three years. She said NKU believes Kentucky must address equity.

Dr. Wells said Kentucky can move to national acclaim by instituting public policy to support, sustain, and reward public engagement by public universities. Kentucky has the opportunity to be the first state to develop public policy designed to empower campus leaders to integrate public engagement into the fabric of their institutions. She said NKU strongly supports efforts and recommends an appropriations funding model that sufficiently supports efforts of the comprehensive universities focusing on public engagement, economic development, P-12 education, and quality of life in the communities. She recommends the application for these funds be made in conjunction with the communities served, with a direct linkage to outcomes that would drive greater economic and quality of life impact. She is confident that this form of funding is an investment that will provide additional revenue to support the services that Kentucky is obligated to provide for its students and citizens. Dr. Wells believes the universities can move this Commonwealth forward.

Representative Buckingham asked if SCOPE has fulfilled the role that was set for it in higher education reform, and how effective has it been. Mr. Layzell said SCOPE has fallen short of the potential envisioned when higher education reform was enacted. He said there has been a struggle to find the proper role and relationships between SCOPE members, and the postsecondary community. He still has great hope for SCOPE, and feels it was a very innovative approach. He welcomes suggestions for making SCOPE more productive.

Representative Siler said the university system in Kentucky is healthier than it was in 1997, and more focused on where it wants to go.

Dr. Ronald Eaglin, President, Morehead State University (MSU), spoke from the audience. He said that rural colleges like Murray State University and Morehead have a tremendous responsibility in economic development, in that they cover great geographic areas where the communities do not have the capacity to do the things that are needed, such as improve healthcare. In many rural areas, these universities are the largest industry in the area. He said Morehead works with over 200 small businesses that will

never have the capacity of a single Ashland, Incorporated. Dr. Eaglin said Dr. Ransdell and Dr. Wells gave wonderful presentations that were right on the money. MSU has seen an 18 percent increase in enrollment with the majority of students receiving financial aid. He urged the members as they look at public policy down the line, to solve the extremity problems in the state. The great economic generators of this state run from Louisville, Cincinnati, down to Bowling Green. Dr. Eaglin said the majority of institutional needs to help the people are out in the rural areas. He wants those communities to be treated equitably when CPE develops a new funding model.

Senator Westwood welcomed Dr. Mary Evans Sias, President, Kentucky State University (KSU), who gave a presentation on her perspective of KSU's current status, and her aspirations for the future of the institution.

Dr. Sias thanked the members for their past support of KSU. She discussed the three jewels of KSU, which are its status as a historically black university, a land grant institution, and a small, liberal arts college.

Dr. Sias said historically black universities provide undergraduate training for three fourths of all black persons holding a doctorate degree; three fourths of all black officers in the armed forces; and four fifths of all black federal judges. They are the lead institutions in awarding baccalaureate degrees to black students in life sciences, physical sciences, mathematics, and engineering. She said they rank high in terms of the proportion of graduates who pursue and complete graduate and professional training, and fifty percent of black faculty in traditionally white research universities received their bachelor's degrees at a historically black university.

Dr. Sias said the land grant institutions provide broader access to higher education, irrespective of wealth or social status. She said also unique to land grant institutions are the three sources of funding such as local county funding, federal, and state funding. KSU's plan of action for their land grant focuses on aquaculture, expanding extension services to health issues such as obesity and diabetes, and providing more mobile educational services through the land grant video uplink services.

Dr. Sias said as a liberal arts college, KSU can provide small classes with sixteen or fewer students. She said KSU can offer scholarships, opportunities for travel abroad, paid internships, and participation in state, regional, and national honors conferences.

Dr. Sias has found several challenges since coming on board at KSU. They include: 1) enrollment size too small to derive economies of scale; 2) weak financials; 3) inadequate and poor quality housing (especially Young Hall); 4) weak information technology infrastructure; 5) inadequate number of graduate programs; 6) ineffective budgeting process; 7) silos among faculty and staff; and 8) land grant match issues.

Dr. Sias said that KSU has begun to address some issues. It has gone from five colleges to three. They have added a Dean of Graduate Education, a Masters in Computer Science this fall, and have applied to the CPE for approval of a MBA program. She said KSU graduated its first student this spring from the new Bachelors in Nursing, and is working on adding a Masters in Special Education. She also said teacher education scores are up, and graduation and retention rates are improved.

Dr. Sias said for KSU to reach its goals, more funding is needed to grow programs, and add additional staff. She said KSU will need \$1.2 million dollars over the next three years in order to reach and attract more Kentucky students to KSU.

Dr. Sias shared her vision for KSU with the subcommittee members. She wants to see KSU challenge itself and its students to be the best. This includes: 1) recognition based on academic excellence and service to students and staff; 2) putting students first; 3) attracting the best, most talented and diverse students, staff and faculty; 4) having significant operational finances drive by sound operations and fund raising; 5) having collegial governance in place; 6) enhancing administrative efficiency and effectiveness; and 7) expanding educational outreach. Dr. Sias summarized by saying the vision includes life long learning, effective teaching, diversity that is valued, and fiscal responsibility vigorously pursued to ensure KSU's future.

Dr. Sias said KSU is specifically working to improve KSU residence halls, increasing student enrollment by ten percent each year, and continuing to improve the quality of academic offerings. She said KSU wants to make student services more accessible to students by streamlining the KSU delivery system, and by making the website more user friendly.

Dr. Sias said KSU is working with the community, and fostering more support from Frankfort. She wants students from KSU to be proud to be a KSU graduate, and she wants more Kentucky students to attend KSU.

Dr. Sias said she is working to increase the KSU alumni base by utilizing their professional expertise and experiences. She wants to make alumni feel more valued and needed, and increase fund raising efforts, and donor giving.

Dr. Sias said KSU cannot be all things to all people. It must recognize its strengths, and expand and excel in those areas. She said KSU must welcome change, and quality improvement. KSU must also be prepared to impart skills to students to allow them to advance in a technologically prepared university. Dr. Sias said as KSU moves forward to achieve the vision, she wants the privilege and the duty to provide those services in the manner that honors KSU's legacy, and represents the very highest quality of service to the students, staff, and faculty. She told the subcommittee members she needs their help to achieve the vision.

With no further business before the subcommittee, the meeting adjourned at 11:47 a.m.